

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Telephone Interview

Initially, the Applicants would like to thank Examiner Hernandez for granting and conducting a telephone interview on August 18, 2011.

During the interview the Applicants' representative discussed the possibility of amending the independent claims to clarify that said second memory is always and only occupied by said processing unit."

As indicated in the interview summary dated September 7, 2011, the Examiner agreed that, if the Applicants filed an amendment including the above-mentioned amendment, then the Ohba reference would most likely be overcome, as long as there is sufficient support for the Applicants' proposed amendments.

II. Amendments to the Claims

Based on the results of the interview, independent claims 1, 8 and 12 have been amended to recite that "said second memory is always and only occupied by said second processing unit."

Furthermore, as discussed during the interview, support for these amendments can be found, at least, in Fig. 1 and paragraphs [0019], [0052], [0065], [0067], [0070] and [0076] of the publication of the present application (i.e., U.S. 2004/0187165). Specifically, the Applicants note that, for example, Fig. 1 illustrates that only the second processing unit 105 has access to the second memory 110. Furthermore, the Applicants note that paragraph [0052] states that the

second processor 105 occupies the second memory 110, such that access to the second memory 110 can not be interrupted by the main bus 101 [or any device communicating on the main bus]. The Applicants note that because the second memory is occupied only by the second memory, it would be understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art that the second memory is always and only occupied by the second memory.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the above-mentioned portions of the present application, it is clear that the second memory is always and only occupied by the second processing unit. As such, the specification of the present application provides sufficient support for the above-mentioned amendments.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Waki (EP 1056290) and Ohba (6,714,660). Further, claims 3-5, 9-14 and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waki and Ohba in view of various combinations of Kawakami (U.S. 2002/0012522) and the Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). These rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 1, 8 and 12 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites an integrated circuit including a bus, a first memory connected to the bus, a first processing unit that accesses the first memory via the bus, a second processing unit, and a second memory that is accessed by the second processing unit without passing through the bus, such that the second processing unit accesses the second memory without accessing the bus. Further, claim 1 recites that the second memory is always and only occupied by the second processing unit.

As discussed during the interview, the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection (i) equates the image memory 43 of Ohba with the claimed second memory, (ii) equates the PCRTC 44 and the rendering engine 41 of Ohba with the claimed second processing unit, and (iii) equates the CPU 31 of Ohba with the claimed first processing part. However, in view of the above-identified amendments to claim 1, which clarify the structure of the second memory and the second processing unit, it is submitted that Ohba fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features now required by the second memory and the second processing unit, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Rather, as discussed during the interview, Ohba teaches that the memory 43 is used (e.g., occupied) by both (i) the main CPU 31 (see col. 6, lines 60-65) and (ii) the PCRTC 44 and rendering engine 41 (see col. 7, lines 20-30). In other words, Ohba teaches a “dual use” of the memory 43 by various processing units.

Thus, in view of the above and as agreed upon during the interview, because Ohba teaches the “dual use” of the memory, Ohba fails to disclose or suggest that the second memory is always and only occupied by the second processing unit, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that independent claim 1 and claims 7 and 15 that depend therefrom are not anticipated by Waki.

Regarding dependent claims 2-6, which were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waki and Ohba (main references) in view of various combinations of Kawakami and the AAPA (additional references), it is respectfully submitted that these additional references do not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claim 1 which are lacking from the main references. Therefore, no obvious combination of the

main references with any of the additional references would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention recited independent claim 1 and claims 2-7 and 15 that depend therefrom.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Waki, Ohba, Kawakami and/or the AAPA or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Waki, Kawakami and/or the AAPA to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 2-7 and 15 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claims 8 and 12 are directed to an electric device and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 8 and 12 and claims 9-11, 13, 14 and 16-19 are allowable over the prior art of record.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Koji KAI et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By 2011.09.16 12:26:01 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/jmj
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
September 16, 2011